DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 116 228 CS 202 431

AUTHOR	Chaffee, Steven H.; Clarke, Peter
TITLE	Training and Employment of Ph.D.s in Mass Communication. Journalism Monographs No. 42.
INSTITUTION	Association for Education in Journalism.
PUB DATE	Nov 75
NOTE	38p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Prof. Harold Wilson, AEJ Publications Manager, School of Journalism and Mass Communications, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455 ($2.50)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Career Opportunities; Demand Occupations; *Doctoral Degrees; *Educational Supply; *Employment Opportunities; *Employment Trends; Higher Education; Journalism; *Mass Media; National Surveys

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on two census surveys, one focusing on Ph.D. supply patterns of the past five years and the other probing the anticipated demand for new faculty in the next five years. Information on Ph.D. supply patterns was obtained by mailing questionnaires to administrators or faculty members responsible for the mass communications programs at 17 major universities. Information on the anticipated demand for Ph.D.s was obtained through a one-page questionnaire sent to each of the 135 department heads, chairmen, and directors listed on the Association for Education in Journalism Executive Secretary's mailing list. The results of the surveys are discussed and so are the factors that might influence a change in either the supply or the demand curve for future Ph.D.s. (RB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED116228

JM

journalism monographs

CS 202 431

NUMBER FORTY-TWO

STEVEN H. CHAFFEE and
PETER CLARKE

Training and Employment of Ph.D.s in Mass Communication

NOVEMBER 1975

Published serially since 1966 by the Association for Education in Journalism. Supported by the American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism.

AEJ

An AEJ Publication

JOURNALISM MONOGRAPHS is one of four official publications of the Association for Education in Journalism: *Journalism Quarterly* (founded in 1924); *The Journalism Educator* (founded in 1946), which continues its affiliation with the American Society of Journalism School Administrators; *Journalism Abstracts* (founded in 1963); and JOURNALISM MONOGRAPHS (founded in 1966).

JOURNALISM MONOGRAPHS was supported for its first two years by a gift from the University of Texas, and since then by the American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism.

For all four publications, business correspondence should be directed to Prof. Harold Wilson, AEJ Publications Manager, School of Journalism and Mass Communications, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455.

All numbers are in print and may be ordered from the Publications Manager, singly or in bulk. Attention, librarians: Numbers 1 through 17 are now on microfilm and may be ordered from University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106.

Monographs appearing here are regularly abstracted and indexed in *Historical Abstracts* and *America: History and Life*.

Subscription Rates

New subscription rates, effective January 1, 1976, are $10.00 per year, $10.50 outside the U. S. and Canada.

	Current*	Back Issues
Single copies	$2.50	$3.50
Bulk orders**	$1.75	$2.25

* The four most recent issues.
** Fifteen copies or more.

JOURNALISM MONOGRAPHS

NUMBER FORTY-TWO • NOVEMBER 1975

BRUCE H. WESTLEY, *Editor*

EDITORIAL BOARD

JAMES W. CAREY, STEVEN H. CHAFFEE, DAVID G. CLARK, PETER CLARKE, EVERETTE E. DENNIS, S. WATSON DUNN, RICHARD A. EK, RONALD T. FARRAR, BRADLEY S. GREENBERG, THOMAS H. GUBACK, WILLIAM A. HACHTEN, HANNO HARDT, LAWRENCE W. LICHTY, L. JOHN MARTIN, MAXWELL E. McCOMBS, JACK M. McLEOD, JOHN T. McNELLY, MICHAEL J. PETRICK, IVAN L. PRESTON, GALEN RARICK, KEITH P. SANDERS, LAWRENCE SCHNEIDER, DONALD L. SHAW, JOHN D. STEVENS, DWIGHT L. TEETER, DAVID H. WEAVER, FREDERICK T. C. YU.

Members of the AEJ Publications Committee: DWIGHT L. TEETER *(Chairman)*, DONALD R. GRUBB, ROBERT V. HUDSON, PHILLIP J. TICHENOR, JOHN STEVENS, MAXWELL E. McCOMBS.

Published serially at Lexington, Kentucky, by the Association for Education in Journalism with the support of the American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism.

Manuscripts and other editorial correspondence should be addressed to the editor, Prof. Bruce H. Westley, School of Journalism, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky 40506. Business correspondence, including subscriptions, should be directed to AEJ Publications Manager, School of Journalism, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455.

Subscription rates: $10.00 per year, $10.50 outside the United States and Canada. Checks should be made out to Journalism Monographs.

STEVEN H. CHAFFEE and
PETER CLARKE

Training and Employment of Ph.D.s in Mass Communication

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Association for
Education in Journalism

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

(Copyright 1975 by the Association for Education in Journalism)

STEVEN H. CHAFFEE is Vilas Research Professor in the School of Journalism and Mass Communication at the University of Wisconsin–Madison. PETER CLARKE is professor and chairman of the Department of Journalism at the University of Michigan. This report was initially presented to the annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism at Fort Collins, Colorado, in August, 1973, sponsored by the Standing Committee on Research.

GRADUATE schools in American universities have recently been faced with a dramatic shrinkage in the job prospects for their graduates. Many factors have contributed to this crisis. Industrial and commercial employment has been stunted by inflation, a bearish stock market, uncertain funding from governmental contracts and other consequences of a both-guns-and-butter economy. Academic research jobs have dwindled rapidly as governmental and foundation monies have been redirected toward the "private sector" and to projects that seem to promise more immediate payoffs than research institutes can claim. Academic teaching employment has become comparatively scarcer as enrollments have leveled off, alternative jobs have vanished, a taxpayers' revolt has hit state budgets and private donors have had less loose money for higher education.

This radically tightened job market has seemingly been an across-the-board phenomenon, affecting all branches of academe. It had long been commonplace for Ph.D.s in such overcrowded fields as English and history to be unable to find suitable employment after graduation. But the current pinch extends to such long-prosperous disciplines as physics, psychology, engineering and the life sciences.[1] Even high enrollments and clear "relevance" to current social problems provide no guarantee of immunity. Two recent surveys by Wolfle and Kidd and McGinnis and Solomon[2] have concluded that there is a serious overproduction of Ph.D.s in sociology—a field uncomfortably close to the activities of graduate departments of journalism and mass communication. Burd argues that Ph.D.s heading into journalism education may similarly face "a grim academic future."[3]

Still, there are reasons for suspecting that mass communication research and journalism education might be a special case, a small field that could pass relatively unscathed through the current academic employment crisis. Journalism enrollments are on the

rise, having nearly tripled in the past decade.[4] Since they have never benefited much from either federal grants or foundation largesse, journalism departments are not likely to miss those monies so much now that they have been taken away. And journalism schools have gradually diversified their curricula to match innovations in the communication industries and other demands for communicatory skills.

Almost all journalism programs were founded to train professional news personnel. Accordingly, journalism faculties have, with rare exceptions, been staffed heavily by persons whose professional experience in the mass media has substituted for the doctorate that most academic departments consider a "union card." In a survey of newswriting instructors, Hulteng found that nearly two-thirds were associate or full professors, and nearly three-fourths had worked for five years or more as professional journalists. Less than half of them held doctorates.[5]

MacDougall believes that doctoral training programs and "publish or perish" promotion standards are "ruining" journalism schools.[6] But, as we will show here, less than a dozen universities have been producing mass communications Ph.D.s at the rate of two or more per year. And a ten-year survey of six academic journals devoted to communication shows only six journalism faculties that have published research at the rate of at least one full article-equivalent every five years per professor.[7] Research productivity, for which the Ph.D. prepares future teachers, has never been essential to hiring, promotion or tenure on many journalism faculties. Simply holding the doctorate is often of some help to faculty career advancement, but as an administrative requirement or because it is looked on as useful preparation for teaching.[8]

None of this should come as a surprise to anyone in journalism education. But those planning graduate academic programs in mass communication—prospective students as well as professors and administrators—need a careful empirical assessment of the job market. Gross linear projections of recent statistical trends are preferable to no evidence, but not much. A minor attempt by Chaffee yielded the conclusion that mass communication does not face immediately the kind of Ph.D. surplus that has beset so many other fields.[9] But a job market, like any other market, is the

resultant of two interdependent factors, supply and demand. Detailed analyses of both the supply of mass communication Ph.D.s and the demand for them in journalism education are necessary to evaluate this market.

This paper reports two census surveys, one focusing on Ph.D. supply patterns of the past five years and the other probing the anticipated demand for new faculty in the next five years.[10] Taken together, these two studies can provide a more coherent picture of the field than has heretofore been available. A discussion of factors that might influence either the supply or the demand curve in the future follows presentation of the two surveys.

Study No. 1
Training and Placement

In early 1973 a survey of all schools in the U.S. offering the Ph.D. in mass communication was conducted by mailing questionnaires to administrators or faculty members responsible for these programs.[11] In all, 17 schools were identified that met our minimal criteria of 1) formal ties to a department or school of journalism, mass communication or the equivalent, and 2) at least one Ph.D. candidate (having passed preliminary exams) who had departed for full-time employment from 1968 through 1972. Programs fitting this description were found at the universities of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan State, Minnesota, Missouri, North Carolina, Northwestern, Ohio, Oklahoma State, Pennsylvania, Southern Illinois, Stanford, Syracuse, Texas, Washington and Wisconsin.

Data were gathered regarding each departing Ph.D. candidate's most recent transition from enrolled student to full-time employee: year of departure, sex, citizenship and race, candidate's status at the time of departure (were all degree requirements, including dissertation, completed, or did he have remaining obligations?), fields of study pursued within mass communication and the extent he had been examined on his competence in each field in preliminary examinations; and finally the kind of job he had gone to—within or outside academic institutions.

Women and Minorities. Those who are charged with filing affirmative action reports will find some of our most obvious

analyses useful. During the five-year period, 402 persons departed the 17 programs for full-time work, 72 per cent of them with all degree requirements completed. Of the total departures, 10 per cent are women, a figure that shows no appreciable change over the five years. Similarly, 10 per cent are non-whites. But only five of the 42 non-whites are U.S. citizens; the rest are foreign nationals. These are the demographic categories that interest the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Program Productivity. Our concerns in this paper are more explicit to the discipline. We promised participating schools—which devoted hours to combing student records and prompting faculty recall—that individual programs would not be identified in our report. Nevertheless, it is important to gain some sense of the relative productivity of institutions. Figure 1 provides this, arraying the 17 schools (anonymously) from largest to smallest in terms of number of departures between 1968 and 1972. The shaded area of each bar in Figure 1 indicates the number who left with all requirements completed.

Two facts in Figure 1 deserve notice. First, there is the steady linear pattern of descent from the most productive school to the least. Unlike some fields, there is no rapidly descending "J-curve," which would have indicated dominance in productivity by one or two institutions. We can conclude that doctoral production in mass communication is *polycentric*.

This polycentrism is even more pronounced when attention is confined to those who departed with the Ph.D. in hand, the shaded areas of Figure 1. Four programs graduated 30 to 35 persons and another three sent out 20 to 30 Ph.D.s over the five-year period.

The second important pattern in Figure 1 concerns the proportions of departures with requirements completed. There is substantial variation among programs in this respect. Vivid contrasts appear between the schools ranked 5th and 6th, and especially between those ranked 10th and 11th, for example. Looking at Figure 1 as a whole, it is clear that most schools, including the five largest programs, send a sizable minority of their doctoral students to full-time jobs in an "A. B. D." (all but dissertation) status.

Fields of Specialization. Despite the inauguration of several doctoral programs within the period of the study, the total num-

ber of departures per year did not change from 1968 to 1972. Approximately 90 persons obtained employment in each of those years. In between, there was a sharp dip in 1969 and only a partial recovery in 1970. (Our best estimate of the rate of supply, then, would be an additional input of perhaps 450 persons with doctoral training over the next five years.) Before analyzing their job destinations, we need to take a closer look at the specific academic fields within mass communication for which people are being trained.

Our questionnaire provided labels for fields corresponding to research-oriented AEJ divisions, plus an opportunity to amplify

FIGURE 1

Number of Departures per School and Number Who Left with All Degree Requirements Completed



FIGURE 2

Proportion of Departures Following Each Field of Study, by Year



with open-end comments. The analyses in Figure 2 and later in this report are based on a merging of the open-end remarks (which we coded) with the closed categorical data.

Figure 2 demonstrates that communication theory and (behavioral) research methodology is clearly the most common single specialization, followed by mass communications and society. International and history rank lower, and communications law is the rarest field of study.

Over time, we can discern only two trends in Figure 2, and either of these could easily be erased by additional data for 1973. One is an apparent increase in the proportion of candidates studying mass communications and society. The other is a decline in specialization in historical research. Otherwise there is remarkable stability in the relative standing of the five fields across the five years.

While Figure 2 appears to present these fields in terms of a zero-sum game in which one type of specialization reduces the likelihood of another, this is not necessarily the case. A doctoral student might well combine field preparation in several of these fields. Patterns of between-field combination are shown in Table 1, which presents correlations (Gamma coefficients) among fields, calculated across the 402 departing students. The total percentage pursuing each field is shown in the right-hand column.

It is clear in Table 1 that the fields of communications law, history and mass communications and society comprise a general cluster, in that students specializing in one of these three are fairly

TABLE 1

Correlations Among Fields of Study

	Mass Comm & Society	History	Theory-Methodology	International	Percentage in each field
Law	.59	.68	-.64	-.03	11%
Mass Comm & Society		.41	-.50	-.14	42%
History			-.71	-.25	23%
Theory & Methodology				-.41	61%
International					28%

NOTE. All entries are Gamma coefficients.

likely to follow one of the others as well. Apparently the students, or their faculty supervisors, see a communality of method or substance within this cluster. The time trends in Figure 2, away from history and toward mass communications and society, then, can be interpreted as a shift within a broad field but not necessarily within the general area of mass communication research.

By contrast, communication theory and methodology together constitute a distinct field that is extremely unlikely to overlap with the others. This means that the apparent numerical dominance of theory and methodology studies in Figure 2 is overdrawn, when it is compared with the overall total for the three-field cluster of law, history and mass communication and society.

Candidates in international communication studies appear to be a third group, although not totally distinct from the others. They may or may not also take law or focus on mass communication and society. They are less likely to be students of communication history, and they especially avoid theory and methodology.

To describe the supply of persons available to teach combinations of fields, we can give direct numerical meanings for the data behind Table 1. The law-history combination has been studied by 27 per cent of all candidates and the international-history combination by 17 per cent. Thirteen per cent combined international and theory but only 7 per cent have field training in both history and theory.

Job Destinations. A major portion of our analysis concerns where people go to work. We asked for information about the institutional context of first employment: did the candidate go to an academic setting, a private corporation, a government agency or somewhere else? If academic, we wanted to know whether it was a junior college, a four-year college, a university with only an undergraduate program in the employing department or a university with a master's or doctoral program. The name of the academic department was also supplied, to check on the extent of migration of mass communication Ph.D.s into other academic disciplines.

Figure 3 compares 1968 and 1972, the two boundary years for the survey, when 89 and 90 candidates, respectively, left doctoral programs for jobs. Figure 3 demonstrates a remarkable stability in the pattern of job destinations. In percentage terms, there was an

increase in government employment and a slight drop in private-sector jobs, but these figures are dwarfed by the 7 of 9 candidates who entered academic work. Few of these went to two- or four-year colleges, or to non-teaching academic posts. University employment is the rule.

The proportion going to university graduate programs declined somewhat, but this is due to a decreased flow into departments that offer the master's as their highest degree. Increasingly, candidates go to departments whose highest degree is *either* the B.A. or the Ph.D. (As will be seen in Study No. 2, this is at least partly because large journalism M.A. programs are less likely to want to hire Ph.D.s than any other category of school.)

Four out of every five of these academic jobs are in departments of journalism, mass communication and the like. Some 8 per cent went to departments of speech and another 9 per cent to all other social science and humanities fields combined.

School-by-school breakdowns of job destinations of Ph.D.s are presented in Figure 4. Doctoral preparation in mass communication feeds into what Caplow and McGee call an "academic marketplace."[12] As they, and more elaborately Jencks and Riesman, have pointed out, this marketplace functions through a status hierarchy and a system of rewards based more on prestige than on harder forms of currency.[13] The most-valued jobs are teaching posts in departments offering graduate research degrees. Figure 4, which arrays departments in order of number of doctoral candidates (as in Figure 1), shows a wide range of variation in the type of academic work to which different programs send their products.

At the top of each bar in Figure 4 is listed the number of candidates from that school who took academic jobs. Percentages within this number are indicated for those going to Ph.D. campuses (the cross-hatched portion of bar), to master's programs (diagonal shading), to undergraduate schools (clear) and to academic work other than university-level teaching (dotted).

Among the schools that sent at least two persons a year into academic work, the greatest contrast is found between the campuses that ranked 5th and 6th, respectively, in total Ph.D. production. The 5th-ranked school sent only 35 per cent of its candidates to departments offering graduate studies, whereas the 6th-ranked

FIGURE 3

Occupational Destination of Departures for Two Years



FIGURE 4

Proportion of Departures Going to Different Types of Academic Jobs, by School (Ns at top of bars)



placed 78 per cent in these more prestigious programs. The fact that these two schools produced rather similar total numbers of candidates underscores the fact that doctoral program size *per se* does not predict eventual job placement.

While there is no general tendency for larger than smaller programs to place their candidates in more prestigious jobs, some "microscopic" evidence of such a pattern can be discerned from careful inspection of Figure 4. Looking at the five largest programs as a group, there is a steady shrinkage from the first to the fifth in the percentage placed in graduate teaching jobs. Starting anew at the 6th-ranked school, there is a repetition of this pattern across most of the rest of Figure 4 until the number of candidates becomes too small to provide meaningful percentages. If these are looked on as two distinct groups of doctoral schools—the larger (and presumably more established) ones, and the smaller (in most cases, newer) ones—then program size does seem to be an indicator of the kind of campus that will be supplied with faculty from a particular source university.

Many institutional factors that might help explain differences in placement from one school to another cannot be explored here without violating the confidentiality of our data sources. Two questions can be examined, however.

One concerns the academic status of the candidate when he departs for full-time employment. There is clearly a benefit in leaving with Ph.D. in hand. The probability of landing in a department offering graduate studies is 40 per cent greater if the person has completed all doctoral requirements. Looking at the same issue school-by-school, and considering only the 11 programs that produced at least two candidates a year during the period of our survey, there is a correlation of .62 between the schools' ranks in terms of percentage leaving with Ph.D. and percentage going to departments that offer graduate work.

A second potential factor in academic job placement might be the research productivity of the faculty offering the doctoral program. One much used quantitative indicator of faculty resources is the number of research articles and monographs published in scholarly journals. The philosophical issues and technical problems surrounding the use of such an index are legion, but data on the point have been assembled by Cole and Bowers.[14] When

schools are grouped according to the volume of faculty research output (either overall or per capita), no impressive or systematic differences emerge in terms of the proportion of doctoral students who secure positions in departments offering graduate studies.

One other correlate of job placement we have examined is field of specialization. We have already noted interrelationships among these. Is the pursuit of any particular field as a graduate student related to the kind of job the person later finds?

Figure 5 shows the relevant data in terms of the proportions going to faculties that grant graduate degrees. For each field, two bars are shown. The shaded bar indicates those who studied the field and the open bar those who did not. The length of each bar represents the probability of joining a graduate faculty.

Candidates with training in communication theory and (behavioral) research methodology were clearly more likely than persons without this kind of background to find jobs in departments with master's and doctoral programs. By contrast, candidates who had specialized in international studies or mass communications and society were less likely than other candidates to be hired by the more prestigious graduate departments. Neither history nor law seems to make much difference either way.

Closer examination of our data suggests that the case of international communication is a special one. Almost four out of ten candidates in the international field were themselves foreign nationals. These students are just as likely to complete their degrees before leaving school as are U.S. citizens—but they are far less likely to obtain employment in departments offering advanced degrees. To some extent this happens because graduate programs are rare outside the U.S., and foreign nationals are less likely to stay within this country than are citizens. It may also be the case that non-citizens compete less successfully for prestigious academic jobs here. Whatever the reason, this employment pattern for foreign nationals explains most of the difference in Figure 5 between candidates with training in the international field and others.

Summary. The supply of mass communication Ph.D.s has been remarkably stable over the past five years, in terms of fields of specialization and job destinations, as well as in total numbers.

FIGURE 5

Proportion of Academic Job Takers Who Went to University Teaching Departments Offering MA or PhD Degrees, by Field of Training



Further, it is distributed rather equably across doctoral campuses in a polycentric pattern.

Approximately 70 candidates a year have been going to academic jobs, a substantial minority of them in A.B.D. status. Looking ahead five years and assuming continued stability, the field would seem unlikely to supply more than 350 Ph.D.s to journalism faculties. To assess the job market that will await these graduates, we turn to our second study. Factors that might disturb the stability of Ph.D. supply will be discussed later.

Study No. 2:
Anticipated Demand for Ph.D.s and Media Experience

In June 1973, a one-page questionnaire was sent to each of the 136 department heads, chairmen and directors listed on the AEJ Executive Secretary's mailing list.[15] Of these, 109 were returned, a response rate of 80 per cent. Since other sources of data on all 136 schools are available, it is also possible to project estimates of the overall figures that could be expected had there been a 100 per cent response rate. Some linear projections of this type are presented here in the interest of approximating a full census to complement Study No. 1.

The main purpose of the survey was to estimate the total number of job openings in journalism education over the next five years, and the kinds of people—in terms of academic degrees and media experience—who would fill them. There is no certain method for such predictions, of course. Departmental administrators were selected as the sources for our basic data on the assumption that they are more "expert" than anyone else on these questions. Creating one overall estimate from many small ones should maximize the chance that errors due to either overly optimistic or overly pessimistic expectations might neutralize one another.

The main body of the questionnaire consisted of two four-by-four matrices. In the first, the administrator was asked to indicate the number of full-time faculty members his school will have during the coming 1973-74 academic year. The four columns of this table represent four levels of "highest academic degree held," ranging from "none" to "BA/BS" to "MA/MS/MJ" to "Ph.D." The four rows represent "years of professional experience in

media," ranging from "none" to "less than 5 years" [*sic*] to "6-10 years" to "more than 10 years."[16]

The second question presented the same four-by-four matrix, but this time asked the following question:

> Now looking ahead five years to the 1978-79 academic year, please try to estimate how many full-time faculty members you would expect to have jobs for, including present slots. (While this is conjecture, your best estimate will be appreciated. It is more valid than any other source of evidence.)

Although there were some difficulties with this matrix, such as the disposition of MFA and J.D. degrees (and the occasional faculty member with exactly five years of professional experience), most respondents were apparently able to use it. The estimates for 1978-79 are necessarily some sort of compromise between what the administrators hope to have and what they expect to have, as several of them noted in marginal comments. Since this paper is in a way a report back to those very administrators, their estimates are taken at face value here. Questions about the validity of their estimates remain an appropriate topic for discussion and comment.

An additional question was asked: "How many of your present full-time faculty members do you estimate you will *lose* via retirement, leaving for other jobs, or for other reasons, during the next five years?" This number, added to the difference between the total number of faculty in the second matrix, minus that in the first, provides our estimate of the total job openings expected at each school in the next five years. (When these figures are aggregated across all schools, there will be a slight overestimate of total openings, since some professors leaving their present schools will be filling open slots at other schools.)

The foregoing measures comprise the main data of the survey. Supplementary data have been used to categorize programs, to provide a rough indication of the types of schools in which various types of job openings will occur. The questionnaire gathered some of these supplementary data by asking what types of curriculum specialties were offered at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Additional data on enrollments and degrees conferred were taken from the most recent *Journalism Educator* survey.[17]

From these supplementary data, the following rough categories were defined: schools with doctoral programs (N=21), schools

with major master's programs—at least 10 graduate degrees granted in 1972—(N=17), schools with small master's programs (N=21), schools with major undergraduate programs—at least 20 bachelor's degrees granted in 1972—(N=26), and schools with small undergraduate programs (N=24).

While those boundaries are arbitrary, and may group together some quite disparate programs in terms of substantive specialties, they are fairly informative descriptions for prospective faculty members. In general, one can expect that the degree of faculty specialization and the emphasis on research activities will decrease systematically from the doctoral campuses to the small undergraduate programs.

It should be noted that this census has ignored the two-year junior college and community college programs, of which there are more than 550 across the country.[18] With few exceptions, journalism at two-year colleges is represented by a single faculty member and, since most of these campuses already have their journalism instructors, we should not expect them to open up many new faculty slots. For that reason they have not been incorporated in the estimates reported here. However, we may expect a modest but steady growth in the number of two-year college one-teacher journalism programs in the immediate future.

Study No. 1 shows roughly one mass communication doctoral candidate a year has been going into two-year college journalism teaching. These slots are typically filled instead by faculty from other fields, to "round out" their teaching loads and provide a school newspaper adviser.[19] Few of them have either media experience or graduate journalism education as teaching preparation. Whether junior college administrators would change this staffing practice if more qualified journalism instructors were available is open to question. Minimum "student contact hours" requirements in many junior college systems make it difficult to create a full-time slot devoted entirely to journalism teaching.

Overall Growth Patterns. The most general, and the dominant, conclusion from the survey is that journalism administrators collectively foresee substantial expansion of their faculties in the next five years. Table 2 summarizes the overall results in terms of the absolute number of jobs in each degree-experience category at the

109 responding schools. The expected numbers for 1978-79 are shown in parentheses.

TABLE 2

Present and Expected Number of Faculty Members at 109 Journalism Departments, to 1978-1979

Years of Media Experience	Highest Academic Degree Held				Row Total
	None	BA/BS	MA/MS/MJ	Ph.D.	
None	1 (1)	2 (2)	21 (12)	64 (82)	88 (97)
1-5 years	10 (10)	11 (8)	139 (143)	178 (285)	338 (446)
6-10 years	4 (11)	17 (18)	178 (221)	149 (232)	348 (482)
10+ years	11 (13)	65 (49)	189 (204)	113 (129)	378 (395)
Column total	26 (35)	95 (77)	527 (580)	504 (728)	1152 (1420)

NOTE. Present (1973-74) faculty are indicated by the first number in each cell. Expected (1978-79) faculty are in parentheses.

To their 1973-74 base of 1,152 faculty members, these administrators expect to add 268 new slots—a 23 per cent growth rate. An additional 227 slots (20 per cent) are expected to open up due to loss of faculty via retirement, etc. Figuring these rates for the schools that did not respond to the survey would add roughly another 110 slots to the total. In all, this indicates some 600 faculty openings in journalism departments between 1973-74 and 1978-79. Comparing that figure with the results of Study No. 1, it appears that Ph.D.s will be available for only some 60 per cent of those jobs.

Although only 44 per cent of journalism faculty slots are now held by Ph.D.s, Table 2 does not suggest any danger of a surplus of doctorates. Most of the anticipated growth in journalism faculties consists of added slots that are expected to be filled by Ph.D.s (84 per cent of them). Adding to that estimate a 1-to-1 replacement (in terms of academic qualifications) of present faculty members who leave or retire, approximately 65 per cent of the job openings apparently await candidates with doctoral training. This demand

level is only slightly above the projected supply level of 60 per cent, leaving room for very modest expansion of Ph.D. production in the near future.

Table 2 shows several other anticipated trends that are also noteworthy. The number of professors without advanced degrees will decrease slightly. There will, however, be a continued increase in jobs for those with media experience and a master's degree. In terms of experience, the main growth will be in the middle range: only a few openings for those with no media background and not many prospective teachers who have worked for more than ten years in the media.

These patterns are shown graphically in percentage form in Figure 6. The fastest-growing categories are expected to be Ph.D.s with some (1-5 years) or fairly extensive (6-10 years) media experience. The net result of these shifts will be a gradual change in the composition of journalism faculties toward less experienced but more academically prepared teachers. Significantly, even though those with more than ten years of media experience will increase in absolute numbers, they will decline proportionately: as a group they will constitute less than 28 per cent of all (expected) journalism professors in 1978-79, as compared with 33 per cent today. Ph.D.s, on the other hand, should become a majority group in the next few years. The administrators expect them to increase from their present 44 per cent to nearly 52 per cent by 1978-79.

This does not mean that journalism administrators plan to develop "inexperienced" faculties. MacDougall, the most vocal spokesman for professional experience as the sole criterion for journalism teaching, considers five years of media work necessary.[20] The data from this survey indicate a decline of only one point (from 63 to 62) in the relative size of the "five or more years" group. It is quite clear, though, that a highly experienced professional will have an ever greater chance of finding a teaching job if he also brings doctoral training to his classroom. Lindley's survey of administrators yielded the same conclusion.[21]

Type of Program. Turning next to breakdowns by type of program, Table 3 shows that the total number of faculty members is greatest in the schools with doctoral programs and gets progressively smaller from the major to the small master's and bachelor's programs. The expected faculty growth rate for the next five

years, conversely, gets progressively larger as we look across Table 3. Doctoral schools anticipate a faculty growth rate that is only one-third the rate of increase at small bachelor's degree campuses. Nevertheless there will be a greater number of total openings (adding new slots to those vacated by retirement, etc.) at doctoral

FIGURE 6

Expected Percentage Change in Faculty 1973-74 to 1978-79, by Media Experience and Academic Degree



TABLE 3

Selected Faculty Characteristics, by Type of School

	Doctoral program	Major master's	Small master's	Major bachelor's	Small bachelor's
No. faculty 1973-74	383	248	214	213	94
Expected % faculty growth to 1978-79	16%	18%	22%	35%	45%
Expected new slots and slots to open via retirement	140	78	89	126	61
Expected net gain in Ph.D.s	90	21	37	46	32
% of Ph.D.s going to program type*	40%	9%	16%	20%	14%
Expected net gain in non-Ph.D.s	-29	23	10	28	10
1973-74 % Ph.D.s	54%	41%	44%	33%	32%
1978-79 % Ph.D.s	67%	42%	51%	40%	46%
1973-74 % no experience	16%	4%	3%	2%	5%
1978-79 % no experience	15%	4%	3%	2%	3%
1973-74 % 10+ yrs exp.	25%	40%	33%	37%	36%
1978-79 % 10+ yrs exp.	24%	34%	24%	32%	26%
1973-74 % 5+ yrs. exp.	54%	66%	66%	69%	70%
1978-79 % 5+ yrs. exp.	50%	66%	63%	72%	68%
(No. of schools in category)	(21)	(17)	(21)	(26)	(24)

*This row totals to 99% due to rounding.

schools than any others. Major bachelor's degree-granting schools will also have a large number of openings—more than twice as many as the small bachelor's schools, despite a lesser growth rate. Over all, the smaller programs will fall farther behind the larger ones in total faculty numbers, even though they are growing faster.

The relative gain in Ph.D.s on different types of faculties is also shown in Table 3. The largest number, about two-fifths of all Ph.D.s, will go to schools that already have doctoral programs. About one-fourth will go to master's campuses, and one-third to bachelor's campuses. Would-be faculty members who do not hold the Ph.D. will apparently find slim prospects at doctoral campuses, where a sizable net drop in non-Ph.D. faculty is expected. Most non-Ph.D.s who are hired will go to major bachelor's and master's programs, which generally have enough enrollment in professional

skills courses that they can create full-time slots for professors who offer no academic teaching specialties.

Of the five types of programs, only the major master's degree schools do not anticipate a substantial increase in the proportion of Ph.D.s on their faculties. The increase will be especially marked at the doctoral campuses—where two-thirds of the professors may be expected to hold Ph.D.s by 1978-79—and at the small bachelor's campuses (if they can find the Ph.D.s they want to hire). At least at the major master's and bachelor's schools, however, Ph.D.s will continue to be a faculty minority group for some years to come.

The remainder of Table 3 deals with the matter of prior media experience of faculty members. There is no evidence of an inclination toward hiring a higher proportion of totally inexperienced faculty, at any type of campus. Apparently each group of schools has developed a small number of slots (except for doctoral schools, no more than one per campus as a rule) that can be handled by non-professional teachers. Highly extensive media experience, on the other hand, will become less common on journalism faculties. In every program category, the proportion of professors who have worked more than ten years in media occupations is expected to drop. About one teacher in four at doctoral and small master's and bachelor's campuses will have had such extensive experience. At the major master's and bachelor's schools (which are less inclined toward hiring Ph.D.s), the administrators intend to hold this figure at about one professor in three.

Substantial media experience, as represented by MacDougall's five years of professional work, will continue to be the rule in journalism education. At least half the teachers at doctoral campuses, and two-thirds of those elsewhere, will bring more than five years of media experience to their classrooms. In all five categories, only small changes in these percentages are anticipated.

The absolute numbers in Table 3 are underestimates, since they are based only on the 109 schools that responded to the questionnaire. In Table 4, the 27 non-responding schools have been added to the appropriate categories, to give more realistic estimates of the numbers of faculty slots at stake. This changes slightly the percentages of Ph.D.s expected to go to different types of programs. It also gives the best available estimate of the percentage of all jobs that will go to Ph.D.s if they are available.

The overall figure in Table 4, which takes into account differential hiring patterns for different types of programs, is 76 per cent. Put in absolute numbers, some 465 job openings for Ph.D.s are anticipated in journalism education over the next five years. This should be considered our best estimate of the demand for candidates from doctoral programs. It contains no hint of a surplus of Ph.D.s in this field.

TABLE 4

Projected Faculty Change for All Schools, by Type of School

	Doctoral program	Major master's	Small master's	Major bachelor's	Small bachelor's	Total
Estimated No. 1973-74 faculty	467	303	282	239	137	1,428
Estimated openings by 1978-79	171	97	117	141	89	615
Projected total openings for Ph.D.s	171	46	92	88	68	465
% of all Ph.D. openings	37%	10%	20%	19%	15%	*
Projected total opening for non-Ph.D.s	0	51	25	53	21	150
% of openings for Ph.D.s	100%	47%	79%	62%	76%	76%
(Number of schools in category)	(23)	(18)	(26)	(32)	(37)	(136)

NOTE. These projections are based on estimates for schools that did not respond to the survey questionnaire, added to the data from responding schools. Non-responding schools were classified, and their faculty sizes estimated, from data on their programs and numbers of degrees granted (Peterson, 1973). Projected total openings were then calculated for non-responding schools according to the growth rates for other schools within the same program category.

*This row totals to 101% due to rounding.

Types of Curricula. In addition to manpower data, this survey asked about the kinds of curricula offered at the schools in the sample. Table 5 presents the results. The curriculum categories are mostly described in terms of professional skills training, and so are more relevant to a candidate's media experience than to his field of academic specialization.

It is clear that very few of these journalism departments limit themselves to the news-editorial area. From doctoral campuses to small bachelor's programs, at least three-fifths of the schools offer

TABLE 5

Percentage of Schools Offering Various Specialties, by Program Category

	Doctoral program	Major master's	Small master's	Major bachelor's	Small bachelor's
News-Editorial	95%	100%	100%	100%	96%
Advertising	85%	71%	86%	85%	71%
Broadcast Journalism	86%	82%	90%	100%	63%
Public Replations	81%	65%	90%	92%	71%
Mass Communication Theory	100%	82%	86%	81%	75%
*Photojournalism	24%	24%	38%	46%	25%
*Film	5%	6%	10%	12%	4%
(N)	(21)	(17)	(21)	(26)	(24)

NOTE. Entries indicate whether the department offers the listed specialty at any level, undergraduate or graduate. Asterisk (*) indicates a specialty that was not listed on the questionnaire, but was written in by the responding administrator.

each of the five specialties that were listed on the questionnaire. This includes not only the job-oriented advertising, broadcast and public relations fields, but even the once-resisted topic of "mass communication theory."

In addition, "photojournalism" was written in by at least one-quarter of the administrators in every category, as a specialty they consider important enough to warrant mention at their schools. It would be incorrect to infer from this that journalism schools have adopted a full-scale "multi-media" curriculum, however; the more distant specialty of "film" apparently is offered in connection with only one or two journalism programs in any category.

Discussion

Our consideration of the job market to this point has necessarily been based on the assumption that the currently stable supply and demand patterns in the field will continue. A few factors might disturb these patterns.[22]

Factors that Might Increase Demand. Jencks and Riesman[23] concluded that all colleges and universities, no matter what the original purposes for which they were established, tend in time to conform to a single professional norm in both curriculum and faculty. Even church-related and technological or agricultural schools gradually develop standardized liberal arts curricula,

taught by professors hired from the major graduate schools on the basis of scholarly attainments. What Jencks and Riesman found for colleges is also probably true for departments, and journalism seems to be a case in point.

Many administrators in Lindley's survey of journalism education[24] reported pressure from higher administrative levels to hire Ph.D.s "whether they need them or not." The doctoral degree is obviously becoming more of a standard, across departments and across campuses. It appears in our Study No. 2, however, that this long-range trend has already been taken into account by the administrators responding to our questionnaire. Hence, it should not appreciably disturb the patterns on which our conclusions are based.

A second source of increased demand for Ph.D.s might be less easy to anticipate. Jencks and Riesman attributed the main pressure toward standardization of college curricula to the fact that faculties consist mainly of professionalized scholars, seemingly more attentive to their disciplines and to academe in general than to their local campuses. Following the Jencks-Riesman line of thinking, the expected increase in the proportion of Ph.D.s on journalism faculties could have the net effect of accelerating itself.

As Ph.D.s become a numerical majority on many journalism faculties in coming years, they may be expected to generate additional internal pressure to hire other Ph.D.s. Partly this will come as a result of curriculum change. A doctorate prepares a person to teach research courses and to direct graduate students in theses and dissertations. It does not seem reasonable to expect a sizable concentration of professors who have been so trained to refrain from doing these things. So we will almost certainly see more journalism faculties initiating proposals for graduate programs—which should in turn create an even greater market for mass communication Ph.D.s than is foreseen now.

There is a great deal of room for expansion of curricula "upward" into graduate education, in a field where only 17 universities have been producing Ph.D.s and fewer than 70 offer any graduate degree. At the other end of the picture, there are many campuses that do not have even undergraduate journalism programs but might well initiate them in the next few years. Student pressure for job-oriented and "relevant" curricula could very well

induce administrators to create journalism majors where none exist today. Generally, as Study No. 2 indicates, they will look first to Ph.D.s for faculty candidates; however, Study No. 1 suggests they are likely to be hard to find.

Factors that Might Decrease Demand. While there seems to be every reason to expect that the general increase in demand for Ph.D.s in journalism education will continue, there are several factors that might retard this trend. One is the comparatively low repute the Ph.D. and academic research seem to have fallen into in recent years, in society in general and among undergraduate students in particular. This cultural-political phenomenon is amplified in the case of journalism education by the press itself, which can bring special pressures on university administrators and which has traditionally expressed little support for the scholarly side of journalism curricula.

Internally, too, journalism faculties might tend to exhibit resistance to their own metamorphosis, since almost all their members have professional allegiances based on their media experience. We should expect journalism departments to continue to argue with their own higher administrations for slots that are reserved for experienced professionals, who may have no special academic qualifications. Since this viewpoint bucks the general trend in academics, it may be at those very universities where journalism has most thoroughly adopted the accepted model of research and specialization that this argument will get the most attentive hearing from higher echelons of the academic hierarchy.

Factors that Might Decrease Supply. Mass communication Ph.D. production experienced one abrupt, albeit brief, decline in the 1968-69-70 period. Among the factors that seemed to account for it at the time were the fear of decreased demand (which gave both professors and prospective doctoral students pause), and the reduction of outside (especially federal) funding for research assistants on large scientific projects. The latter factor is still with us; i.e. we are still without many sources of research support. To the extent that doctoral programs in mass communication are constructed around programmatic research projects, this will continue to retard increases in the supply of Ph.D.s in this field.

A second, more culturally based, retarding factor might be that students are less attracted to academic careers than in the past. In

journalism, professional salaries have improved faster than academic salaries in recent years, so any economic attraction to doctoral work is declining at the same time that students in general hold research-oriented careers in low esteem.

One other kind of influence that would decrease the supply of Ph.D.s for journalism education is the option of other kinds of employment. We noted in Study No. 1 a sharp percentage increase in government jobs for mass communication Ph.D.s. There seems to be an expanded public interest in mass media policy and utilization, which could eventually develop into a major alternative career route, analogous to the government and industry employment alternatives in the hard sciences.

Factors that Might Increase Supply. One of the concerns that stimulated this research initially was, to be blunt, the fear that this field might face a Ph.D. surplus. None seems imminent, but such a situation is always possible if there is either a shrunken demand or an inflated supply of Ph.D.s. Several factors might contribute to the latter.

One source of potential oversupply is doctorates from outside mass communication. English and history, neither of which is conceptually distant from journalism, have long produced Ph.D. surpluses; of late, they have been joined by political science and sociology, which relate even more closely to mass communication doctoral research. Will these overcrowded fields spill over their Ph.D.s into journalism? So far, although they have had the potential for several years, they have not. There are several likely contributory reasons. The primary one, quite probably, is that very few doctorates in these academic disciplines have the requisite media experience for journalism faculties. Secondly, even with professional media experience, few students in other fields get exposed to the history, sociology or literature of mass communication in sufficient concentration to prepare them to offer advanced substantive courses in journalism departments. This is likely to discourage both them and the administrators who might hire them from arranging an appointment in an "outside" field such as journalism. There have long been exceptional cases of Ph.D.s from fields other than mass communication who find homes on journalism faculties; there is no evidence that their incidence is on the rise. (There are occasional migrations in the other direction.)

The more immediate source of oversupply would seem likely to come from either a) expansion of existing Ph.D. program output or b) creation of new programs. (This paper in itself might serve as a stimulus to such expansion.) Existing programs are, for the most part, fixed in institutional settings that will not easily allow them to expand dramatically. Program size tends to be pegged to available support, which in turn is based on relatively stable factors such as undergraduate enrollment, media support, university wealth, faculty research programs and university budget constraints. A sudden oversupply from present sources, then, seems unlikely.

What of new programs? Historically, mass communication doctoral offerings have evolved from a conjunction of research-oriented social science departments and journalism faculty, and have typically grown out of journalism master's degree programs that had a clear scholarly component. Given these "prerequisites," there seem to be few candidate campuses.

The most likely schools to move into doctoral programs would be those that already have major master's degree offerings. Yet, with exceptions, this is precisely the group that (Study No. 2, Table 4) indicates the least interest in hiring Ph.D.s for faculty slots; we may infer at least tentatively, then, that they are also relatively uninterested in developing doctoral programs and likely to remain so.

As a field of applied social science, mass communication necessarily relies on more established social science departments on campus for basic coursework for its doctoral students. The most recent rating of graduate programs for the American Council on Education identifies 15 universities as ranking in the top category of "effectiveness of doctoral program" in at least one social science field. Of these, seven already have mass communication doctoral programs (although this field was not evaluated in the survey), as defined in Study No. 1. Of the remainder, however, all but one have no journalism programs at all, and therefore seem improbable as future suppliers of mass communication doctorates.[6] (The single exception is the University of California at Berkeley.) So there seems little chance of an oversupply of doctorates from these most research-oriented campuses, at least.

Summary

In all, the production of Ph.D.s in mass communication is proceeding at a pace that falls short of the job market in journalism education. There is room within this field for judicious patterns of growth. While media experience will continue to be essential for most faculty appointments, the importance of the doctorate is growing. There is a stable market for a variety of academic specialties and professional skills. The candidate who combines these attributes will be even more in demand in the foreseeable future.

NOTES

1. Daniel Wolfle and C. U. Kidd, "Future Market for Ph.D.s," *Science*, 27:784-93 (1971).

2. *Ibid*; Robert McGinnis and Louise Solomon, "Employment Prospects for Ph.D. Sociologists During the Seventies," *American Sociologists*, 8:57-63 (1973).

3. Gene Burd, "Degree Holders Face Cloudy Future in Depressed Knowledge Industry," *Journalism Educator*, 28:9-12 (1973).

4. Paul V. Peterson, "J-Enrollments Keep Climbing," *Journalism Educator*, 29:3-8, 92-96 (1975).

5. John L. Hulteng, "How Basic Newswriting Courses Are Taught at Schools and Departments of Journalism" (Washington, D.C.: ANPA Foundation). Summarized in *ANPA News Research Bulletin* No. 3, 1973.

6. Curtis D. MacDougall, "J-Educators Should Be Required to Have Five Years Media Experience." *Journalism Educator*, 28:12-15 (1973).

7. Richard R. Cole and Thomas A. Bowers, "Research Article Productivity of U.S. Journalism Faculties," *Journalism Quarterly*, 50:246-54 (Summer 1973).

8. William R. Lindley, "Has Importance of Doctorate Increased in Recent Years?" *Journalism Educator*, 28:15-19 (1973). See also Wayne A. Danielson and Nwabu Mgbemena, *A Descriptive Study of College and University Teachers of Journalism in the United States*, AASDJ Studies on Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, No. 2, August, 1975.

9. Steven H. Chaffee, "Many Ph.D.s Should Expect to Teach More, Research Less," *Journalism Educator*, 28:19-21 (1973).

10. Since both surveys are censuses, in which the sample constitutes the universe under study, no tests of statistical significance have been calculated or reported in this paper. References to the "last" and "next" five years are based on the year 1973, when the surveys were conducted.

11. Study No. 1 was conducted by Professor Clarke.

12. Theodore Caplow and Reece J. McGee, *The Academic Marketplace* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1958).

13. Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, *The Academic Revolution* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1968).

14. *Op. cit.*

15. Study No. 2 was conducted by Professor Chaffee, with the assistance of Albert Tims in data analysis.

16. The omission of a category for faculty members with exactly five years of professional experience was an error in questionnaire design. Where this was a problem, the responding administrators solved it by including such professors in the "less than five years" category. Accordingly, in the data tables this line has been relabeled "5 years or less," as suggested by several respondents.

17. Peterson, *op. cit.*

18. Frank Deaver, "Journalism and Student Publications in American Junior Colleges," Journalism Department, University of Alabama, 1972.

19. Deaver, *op. cit.*

20. *Op. cit.*

21. *Op. cit.*

22. This final section, only partly based on the data of the two studies, was prepared by Professor Chaffee to provide a framework for subsequent commentary.

23. *Op. cit.*

24. *Op. cit.*

25. Kenneth D. Roose and Charles J. Andersen, *A Rating of Graduate Programs* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970).

26. The seven universities in the group of 15 with outstanding social science graduate programs but no journalism departments are Brown, Chicago, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, M.I.T., Princeton and Yale. Of these, the M.I.T. doctoral program in international communication, and the Yale program in attitude research, could be considered part of the mass communication field even though they do not meet the criteria for journalism-related doctoral programs established for Study No. 1.

JOURNALISM MONOGRAPHS

No. 1—Walter B. Emery, "Five European Broadcasting Systems." *August 1966*

No. 2—Eugene J. Webb and Jerry R. Salancik, "The Interview, or the Only Wheel in Town." *November 1966*

No. 3—James E. Grunig, "The Role of Information in Economic Decision Making." *December 1966*

No. 4—Linda Weiner Hausman, "Criticism of the Press in U.S. Periodicals, 1900-1939: An Annotated Bibliography." *August 1967*

No. 5—George Gerbner, "The Press and the Dialogue in Education." *September 1967*

No. 6—Peter R. Knights, "The Press Association War of 1866-1867." *December 1967*

No. 7—Elmer Davis, "Report to the President," edited by Ronald T. Farrar. *August 1968*

No. 8—Steven H. Chaffee and L. Scott Ward, "Channels of Communication in School-Community Relations." *September 1968*

No. 9—Walter Wilcox, "The Press, the Jury and the Behavioral Sciences." *October 1968*

No. 10—Don R. Pember, "The Smith Act as a Restraint on the Press." *May 1969*

No. 11—Joy Schaleben, "Getting the Story Out of Nazi Germany: Louis P. Lochner." *June 1969*

No. 12—Carter R. Bryan, "Negro Journalism in America Before Emancipation." *September 1969*

No. 13—George Gerbner, "The Film Hero: A Cross-Cultural Study." *November 1969*

No. 14—Steven H. Chaffee, Keith R. Stamm, Jose L. Guerrero and Leonard P. Tipton, "Experiments on Cognitive Discrepancies and Communication." *December 1969*

No. 15—Darwin Payne, "The Press Corps and the Kennedy Assassination." *February 1970*

No. 16—Elmer A. Beck, "Autopsy of a Labor Daily: The Milwaukee *Leader*," *August 1970*

No. 17—Jim A. Richstad, "The Press Under Martial Law: The Hawaiian Experience." *November 1970*

No. 18—Mary A. Gardner, "The Press of Guatemala." *February 1971*

No. 19—Robert L. Bishop and LaMar S. Mackay, "Mysterious Silence, Lyrical Scream: Government Information in World War II." *May 1971*

No. 20—Philip Palmgreen, "A Daydream Model of Communication." *August 1971*

No. 21—William E. Francois, "Evaluating Programmed News-Writing Instruction." *November 1971*

No. 22—David Gordon, "The 1896 Maryland Shield Law: The American Roots of Evidentiary Privilege for Newsmen." *February 1972*

No. 23—Karlen Mooradian, "The Dawn of Printing." *May 1972*

No. 24—Maxwell E. McCombs, "Mass Media in the Marketplace." *August 1972*

No. 25—John W. Garberson, " 'A Limited Number of Advertising Pages.' " *November 1972*

No. 26—Thomas H. Guback and Steven P. Hill, "The Beginnings of Soviet Broadcasting and the Role of V. I. Lenin." *December 1972*

No. 27—John D. Stevens, "From the Back of the Foxhole: Black Correspondents in World War II." *February 1973*

(Continued on Back Cover)

No. 28–Don Dodson and William A. Hachten, "Communication and Development: African and Afro-American Parallels." *May 1973*

No. 29–Guido H. Stempel III, "Effects on Performance of a Cross-Media Monopoly." *June 1973*

No. 30–Beth Heffner, "Communicatory Accuracy: Four Experiments." *August 1973*

No. 31–Jerry W. Knudson, "The Press and the Bolivian National Revolution." *November 1973*

No. 32–Herbert Strentz, Kenneth Starck, David L. Anderson and Loren Ghiglione, "The Critical Factor: Criticism of the News Media in Journalism Education." *February 1974*

No. 33–Edmund M. Midura, "A. J. Liebling: The Wayward Pressman as Critic." *April 1974*

No. 34–James E. Murphy, "The New Journalism: A Critical Perspective." *May 1974*

No. 35–Donald S. Kreger, "Press Opinion in the Eagleton Affair." *August 1974*

No. 36–Steven H. Chaffee, Ed., Godwin C. Chu, Jack Lyle and Wayne Danielson, "Contributions of Wilbur Schramm to Mass Communication Research." *October 1974*

No. 37–John Dimmick, "The Gate-Keeper: An Uncertainty Theory." *November 1974*

No. 38–Mary Ann Yodelis, "Who Paid The Piper? Publishing Economics in Boston, 1763-1775." *February 1975*

No. 39–Shelton A. Gunaratne, "The Taming of the Press in Sri Lanka." *May 1975*

No. 40–Robert N. Pierce, "Lord Northcliffe: Trans-Atlantic Influences." *August 1975*

No. 41–Mary M. Connors, "Prejudicial Publicity: An Assessment." *September 1975*

No. 42–Steven H. Chaffee and Peter Clarke, "Training and Employment of Ph.D.s in Mass Communication." *November 1975*